

Message Text

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 STATE 034237

21

ORIGIN ARA-03

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 /004 R

66618

DRAFTED BY ARA/PAF: BBELLCJZ

APPROVED BY ARA/PAF:BBELL

----- 049292

O 150153Z FEB 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 034237

HOLD FOR S/S

FOLLOWING REPEAT STATE 034237 SENT ACTION ALL AMERICAN REPUBLIC
DIPLOMATIC POSTS USUN AND USCINCSO DTD 14 FEB 75

QUOTE:

C O N F I D E N T I A L

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE STATE 034237

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR

SUBJECT: PRESS BRIEFING BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY ROGERS

FOLLOWING IS TRANSCRIPT OF SPECIAL PRESS BACKGROUNDER
TODAY, FEBRUARY 13, BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY ROGERS.

DEPT. SPOKESMAN: GOOD MORNING. WE HAVE AS OUR GUEST TODAY
BILL ROGERS, WHO IS, AS I THINK MOST OF YOU KNOW, ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS. HE IS
PREPARED TO TRY TO ANSWER ANY OF YOUR QUESTIONS ON HIS AREA
OF RESPONSIBILITY. UNLESS HE OTHERWISE INDICATES, THIS
SESSION IS ON BACKGROUND, WHICH MEANS YOU SHOULD NOT
ATTRIBUTE HIS COMMENTS TO HIM DIRECTLY BUT TO STATE DEPART-
MENT OFFICIALS OR U.S. OFFICIALS AND YOU SHOULD NOT USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 STATE 034237

DIRECT QUOTES.

I BELIEVE BILL HAS A BRIEF STATEMENT BEFORE TAKING YOUR QUESTIONS.

Q: IN CONNECTION WITH THAT, I'D JUST LIKE TO MAKE THE USUAL REQUEST THAT IF THERE ARE TO BE ANY POLICY DEPARTURES I STRONGLY URGE THAT THEY BE ON THE RECORD.

A: WELL, I WILL MAKE THE USUAL RESPONSE TO THAT, MURREY, THAT WE HAVE ARRANGED TO HAVE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES COME TO PROVIDE BACKGROUND, IN RESPONSE TO THE REQUESTS, I THINK, OF THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE CORRESPONDENTS ACCREDITED TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT, WHO WANTED TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO MEET WITH ASSISTANT SECRETARIES LIKE MR. ROGERS.

AND IF THAT ISN'T THE FEELINGS OF THIS GROUP, AND IF THE GROUP DOES NOT WISH TO HAVE BACKGROUNDEERS WITH ASSISTANT SECRETARIES, I WISH THE GROUP WOULD COMMUNICATE THAT INFORMATION TO US AND WE WILL NOT HAVE THEM.

MR. ROGERS: I DO HAVE A VERY SMALL STATEMENT, WHICH IS FOR ATTRIBUTION WITH RESPECT TO THE RESUMPTION OF RELATIONS BETWEEN CHILE AND BOLIVIA. AND THOSE SPECIALISTS WHO ARE PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN THAT CAN PICK UP A COPY OF THAT FROM BRIAN BELL AFTER THIS IS OVER. (TEXT TO FOLLOW END OF TEL.) IT'S A STATEMENT THAT WE WELCOME THE RESUMPTION OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES.

BEYOND THAT THOUGH, I THINK WE WILL GO ON BACKGROUND; AND THERE WON'T BE ANY MAJOR POLICY DEPARTURES, I ASSURE YOU.

WELL, I THOUGHT IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL TO SAY A WORD OR TWO AT THE OUTSET ABOUT THE TRADE BILL AND ITS EFFECT ON U.S.-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS SO THAT YOU CAN PERHAPS GET A FEEL FOR OUR PERSPECTIVES AND REACTIONS TO THE EVENTS OF THE LAST SEVERAL WEEKS ON THE TRADE BILL QUESTION. AS YOU KNOW, THE CONGRESS ENACTED THE BILL LATE IN DECEMBER IN THE CLOSING HOURS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SESSION. AND IT WAS NOT A PERFECT BILL, BY A LONG SHOT. I DON'T THINK EVEN ITS MOST AVID DEFENDERS WOULD CLAIM IT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 STATE 034237

WAS A PERFECT BILL.

IT DID CONTAIN AN EXTRAORDINARY NUMBER OF PROVISIONS, INCLUDING ONE OR TWO WHICH HAVE ATTRACTED A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF ATTENTION IN LATIN AMERICA -- AND MOST PARTICULARLY, OF COURSE, THE EXCLUSION FROM THE TITLE V GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES OF MEMBERS OF OPEC AND OTHER COMMODITY ORGANIZATIONS WHOSE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS HAVE

AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON WORLD TRADE. AND THIS IS A MODERATELY AMBIGUOUS PROVISION. IT WAS A PROVISION, HOWEVER, WHICH THE SECRETARY, AS YOU KNOW, OPPOSED ON THE RECORD IN HIS TESTIMONY BEFORE THE CONGRESS AND WHICH I ALSO OPPOSED ON THE RECORD IN MY TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE IN DECEMBER.

IN ANY EVENT, IN SPITE OF THE EFFORTS OF A NUMBER OF US IN THE ADMINISTRATION, THAT PROVISION WAS INCLUDED. IT WAS A PROVISION THAT APPEARED IN THE SENATE BILL BUT NOT IN THE HOUSE BILL. BUT IN THE FINAL CONFERENCE VERSION, THE OPEC EXCLUSION CAME OUT, AND THIS MET WITH A GOOD DEAL OF ADVERSE REACTION IN LATIN AMERICA AND, AS YOU KNOW,-

PRECIPITATED A MEETING HERE OF THE PERMANENT COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, WHICH SPENT SEVERAL DAYS DISCUSSING THE ACT AS THE PRESIDENT SIGNED IT AND PRODUCED A RESOLUTION WHICH EXPRESSED RESERVATIONS ABOUT THAT PROVISION OF THE GSP TITLE V AND ALSO REQUESTED THAT IT BE PUT DOWN ON THE AGENDA OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, WHICH WILL MEET HERE IN WASHINGTON AT THE OAS HEADQUARTERS IN APRIL.

THEREAFTER, AS YOU KNOW, THE ARGENTINE GOVERNMENT, FOLLOWING CONSULTATIONS WITH THE OTHER NATIONS OF THE HEMISPHERE, DECIDED THAT IT WOULD BE BEST TO POSTPONE THE MEETING OF THE FOREIGN MINISTERS BEING CONDUCTED INFORMALLY AND OUTSIDE THE AUSPICES OF THE OAS, WHICH HAD BEEN TENTATIVELY SET UP FOR LATE MARCH.

AND THAT'S ABOUT WHERE WE STAND RIGHT NOW, AND IT LEADS ME ESSENTIALLY TO THE COMMENTS THAT I WANTED TO SET DOWN FOR YOU WITH RESPECT TO THE ISSUE -- THAT, FIRST, WE ARE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 STATE 034237

MAKING EVERY EFFORT TO DEVELOP A, IF YOU WILL, MORE BALANCED PERSPECTIVE ON THE TRADE BILL WITHIN LATIN AMERICA. IT IS A HIGHLY COMPLICATED PIECE OF LEGISLATION. ITS CONSEQUENCES ARE VERY LARGE THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE FIELD OF TRADE, NOT JUST IN THE PREFERENCE AREA. I'LL COME AROUND TO THAT IN A MOMENT ON POINT 2. BUT IT, THEREFORE, REQUIRES A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TIME JUST TO UNDERSTAND IT.

WE HAVE NOT EVEN WORKED OUT INTERPRETATIONS OF ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL. WE'RE NOT EXACTLY CERTAIN PRECISELY WHAT IT DOES MEAN. BUT WE ARE NOW, AND WILL BE IN THE NEXT SEVERAL WEEKS PRIOR TO THE OAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING AND PRIOR TO THE MEETING OF FINANCE AND ECONOMY MINISTERS HERE IN MARCH UNDER THE OAS AUSPICES IN THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL -- WE WILL BE WORKING, AS I

SAY, TO TRY TO EXPRESS, DEVELOP, EXPLAIN A MORE BALANCED PERCEPTION OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRADE BILL IN AND TO LATIN AMERICA.

NOW, WITH RESPECT TO THE SUBSTANCE OF WHAT WE'RE GOING TO TRY TO SAY, THAT SUBSTANCE WILL BE THAT THE ACT AS FINALLY ENACTED IS QUITE IMPORTANT AND, ON NET BALANCE, SIGNIFICANTLY BENEFICIAL TO LATIN AMERICA. WE WILL BE STRESSING THE FACT THAT IT WAS THAT LEGISLATION WHICH AUTHORIZED THE UNITED STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MULTI-LATERAL TRADE NEGOTIATIONS -- WHICH, AS YOU KNOW, BEGAN IN GENEVA A COUPLE OF DAYS AGO. HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR THAT BILL, THE UNITED STATES WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS AND, HENCE, THE NEGOTIATIONS COULD NOT HAVE GONE FORWARD.

AS YOU ALSO KNOW, THOSE NEGOTIATIONS ESSENTIALLY HOLD THE HOPES OF THE WORLD FOR FURTHER CONSIDERABLE LIBERALIZATION OF THE WORLD TRADE SYSTEM.

WE HAVE THE AUTHORITY NOW -- IN THE EXECUTIVE -- FOR THE FIRST TIME, TO MAKE MAJOR EFFORTS WITH RESPECT TO THE DISMANTLING OF TARIFF AND NON-TARIFF BARRIERS TO TRADE. AND THE NEXT CHAPTER, THEREFORE, OF TRADE LIBERALIZATION THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WILL BE WRITTEN IN GENEVA; AND IT WILL BE WRITTEN BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT THAT TRADE BILL LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 05 STATE 034237

WAS ENACTED.

NOW, IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO OVER-ESTIMATE THE SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT ASPIRATIONS OF LATIN AMERICA OF WHAT'S GOING ON IN GENEVA. ON THE OTHER HAND, IT'S FAIR TO SAY THAT HAD THAT BILL NOT BEEN ENACTED AND HAD THE GENEVA EFFORTS TOWARD TRADE LIBERALIZATION NOT GONE FORWARD, WE MIGHT WELL HAVE SEEN A NEW CHAPTER IN WORLD TRADE HISTORY OF REVERSION TOWARDS PERFECTIONISM, WHICH WOULD HAVE HAD A VERY SERIOUS EFFECT ON THE DEVELOPMENT ASPIRATIONS OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD -- AND INCLUDING LATIN AMERICA -- SO THAT, ON BALANCE, WE ARE, AS I SAY, ATTEMPTING TO EMPHASIZE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ACT IN A POSITIVE WAY WITH RESPECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE HEMISPHERE.

NOW, WITH RESPECT SPECIFICALLY TO TITLE V, WHICH IS THE PREFERENCE PROVISION AND WHICH WAS THE ONE THAT STIRRED UP ALL THE DIFFICULTY, WE'RE ALSO GOING TO TRY TO MAKE A POINT THERE THAT BASICALLY THIS SHOULD NOT BE INTERPRETED- AS I THINK IT HAS BEEN IN SOME QUARTERS IN LATIN AMERICA - AS AN EXPRESSION OF FUNDAMENTAL, PLAIN, CLEAR-CUT,

UNEQUIVOCAL POLICY ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES TO RETALIATE AGAINST ANY EFFORT TO RATIONALIZE TRADE IN COMMODITIES.

IT IS NOT THAT. IT WAS A PROVISION WHICH, AS I SAY, CREPT INTO THE BILL TOWARD THE LATTER DAYS. IT WAS SOMETHING WHICH THE ADMINISTRATION HAD OPPOSED. AND, CERTAINLY, IT IS NOT AN EXPRESSION OF LONG-TERM U.S. POLICY TO ATTEMPT TO RETALIATE -- AS I THINK IT HAS BEEN INTERPRETED IN SOME QUARTERS IN THE HEMISPHERE.

WELL, WE CAN SPEND A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING ABOUT THE COMPLEXITIES OF THIS EXTRAORDINARY PIECE OF LEGISLATION, BUT, AS I SAY, THE POINT I WANTED TO MAKE WAS THAT WE WILL BE ATTEMPTING IN THE NEXT FEW WEEKS -- PRIOR TO THESE IMPORTANT MEETINGS WHICH ARE COMING UP AND WHICH WILL CONSIDER AGAIN THE TRADE BILL IN THE OAS CONTEXT -- TO

DEVELOP A MORE BALANCED APPRECIATION OF THE TRUE SIGNIFICANT OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 06 STATE 034237

CANCE AND MEANING OF THE LEGISLATION.

BEYOND THAT, I'D BE GLAD TO TAKE ANY QUESTION YOU HAVE WITH RESPECT TO LATIN AMERICA.

Q: MR. ROGERS, ON JANUARY 14TH, MAYNARD GLITMAN CAME DOWN HERE AND GAVE US EXACTLY THE SAME SPEECH WHILE YOU WERE TALKING TO THESE PEOPLE WHO HAD BEEN CALLED IN. NOW, HASN'T IT GONE BEYOND THAT? WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN A MONTH THAT YOU ARE STILL IN THE SAME POSITION THAT WE ARE TRYING TO EXPLAIN?

A: WELL, I THINK WE ARE STILL TRYING TO EXPLAIN. I THINK THE POINT IS THAT WHAT WE ARE NOW TRYING TO DO IS GET A WORD OUT IN LATIN AMERICA ITSELF. WE HAD BEEN MAKING AN EFFORT, AND STILL ARE, TO GET THE POINT ACROSS TO THE OAS AMBASSADORS HERE. WE ARE TRYING TO GET BEYOND THAT ESSENTIALLY TO GET THE STORY OUT IN LATIN AMERICA ITSELF.

Q: HOW ABOUT THE CONGRESS? THE SECRETARY SAID PUBLICLY, I THINK, AT HIS LAST NEWS CONFERENCE THAT AN EFFORT WOULD BE MADE TO TRY TO GET THE OPEC RESTRICTIONS REMOVED FROM THE BILL. AT WHAT POINT IS THAT PROCESS?

A: YOU KNOW, BOTH BENTSEN AND KENNEDY HAVE INTRODUCED AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE OPEC EXCLUSION. THEY ARE MODERATELY DIFFERENT. THE DIFFERENCE ILLUSTRATES -- I DON'T MEAN TO OVER-COMPLICATE THE ISSUE, BUT IT ILLUSTRATES

TES THE IMPORTANCE OF APPROACHING THE MATTER CAREFULLY.

ONE OF THE AMENDMENTS PROVIDES ESSENTIALLY FOR EXCLUSION FROM THE OPEC EXCLUSION ONLY WITH RESPECT TO LATIN AMERICA. THE OTHER INCLUDES SOME OF THE OTHER COUNTRIES THAT DIDN'T EMBARGO OUTSIDE OF LATIN AMERICA.

WE ARE TRYING TO WORK AND CONSULT WITH THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THOSE PROPOSALS TO FIND OUT REALLY WHICH OF THOSE, OR WHICH OTHER ONE, WOULD BE BETTER IN TERMS OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE LEGISLATION.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 07 STATE 034237

WE HAVE NOT TAKEN A PUBLIC POSITION ON THAT ISSUE AT THE PRESENT TIME. THE INITIATIVE RIGHT NOW IS WITH THE CONGRESS, AND, AS THE LATIN AMERICANS KNOW, THERE IS CONSIDERABLE SENTIMENT IN THE CONGRESS, I THINK, TO TRY TO WORK SOMETHING OUT WHICH WILL MEET THE OBJECTIONS OF LATIN AMERICA.

Q: DO YOU SEE ANY REALISTIC POSSIBILITY THAT THE RESTRICTIONS WILL BE REMOVED, SAY, IN THE NEXT SIX MONTHS, EIGHT MONTHS?

A: I THINK IT IS A REALISTIC POSSIBILITY, YES. I THINK THIS CAN BE ADJUSTED, YES. I SAY IT IN THOSE TERMS. I AM NOT PROPHECYING IT.

Q: ISN'T THE STATE DEPARTMENT PRESSING CONGRESS FOR SOME CHANGE IN THE LAW THAT WILL ELIMINATE THE MARK OF CAIN THAT HAS BEEN PUT ON THE FOREHEAD OF VENEZUELA AND ECUADOR? I MEAN, YOU ARE NOT REMAINING SILENT ON THE SUBJECT.

A: NO, NO, WE ARE NOT REMAINING SILENT.

Q: YOU HAVE AN "H" SECTION THAT GOES UP THERE AND TWISTS ARMS.

A: YES, YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. WE HAVE AN H SECTION BUT WE DON'T TWIST ARMS.

Q: WHAT ARE THEY DOING?

A: WE ARE TALKING. WE DON'T PRESSURE CONGRESS. YOU SAID, "ARE WE PRESSURING CONGRESS." WE ARE NOT PRESSURING, BUT WE CERTAINLY ARE TALKING WITH THEM ABOUT THE QUESTION. NO, YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT.

Q: URGING THEM TO CHANGE IT?

A: YES. WE HAVE TAKEN THE POSITION FROM THE BEGINNING THAT THE RIGIDITY IN THAT LEGISLATION WAS WRONG. THE SECRETARY'S STATEMENT ON THIS IN DECEMBER WAS VERY LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 08 STATE 034237

CLEAR, THAT THE HOUSE LEGISLATION HAD AMPLE AUTHORITY FOR THE UNITED STATES TO DETERMINE WHICH COUNTRIES OUGHT TO BE IN AND WHICH COUNTRIES OUGHT TO BE OUTSIDE PREFERENCES. AND ESSENTIALLY OUR BASIC POSITION WAS THAT THE HOUSE LEGISLATION ON THIS ISSUE WAS BETTER THAN THE SENATE VERSION. SO, WE HAVE BEEN URGING, YES.

Q: ON A RELATED ASPECT TO THIS, CAN YOU GIVE US YOUR ESTIMATE OF THE SITUATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ECUADOR, WHICH SEEMS TO BE RELATED TO THE OPEC RESTRICTIONS ON THE TRADE BILL, WITH REGARD TO THE CONFISCATION OF TUNA CATCHES AND TUNA BOATS -- OR EXCUSE ME, TUNA CATCHES AND THE FINING OF THE TUNA FISHERMEN, WHERE THAT STANDS NOW. AND I GATHER YOU SAW THE ECUADORIAN AMBASSADOR YESTERDAY.

A: I DIDN'T. WELL, I SAW HIM IN THE CORRIDORS. BOB INGERSOLL SAW HIM. AND I CAN'T BRING YOU UP TO DATE ON THAT CONVERSATION. HOWEVER, IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT IN GENERAL, AND I HAVEN'T FOLLOWED THIS IN GREAT DETAIL SO I AM NOT REALLY YOUR AUTHORITATIVE SOURCE ON IT, BUT IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT THE BOATS AND THE ECUADORIANS HAVE BEEN NEGOTIATING ABOUT THIS QUESTION, AND WE ARE HOPEFUL THAT THE BOATS ARE GOING TO BE RELEASED IN THE NEXT DAY OR TWO.

Q: BUT DO YOU SEE THIS AS RELATED TO THE DISPUTE OVER THE TRADE BILL?

A: NO, I DON'T, REALLY. AT LEAST WE HAVEN'T INTERPRETED IT THAT WAY, AND I THINK WE OUGHT TO MAKE IT VERY CLEAR THAT WE DON'T INTERPRET THIS AS ANY KIND OF RETALIATION.

THE ECUADORIANS HAVE HAD THIS POSITION, AS YOU KNOW, FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS WITH RESPECT TO THE 200-MILE LIMIT. THERE WERE NO SEIZURES LAST YEAR, IF I UNDERSTAND THE MATTER CORRECTLY. AND THAT, I THINK WAS IN LARGE PART A REFLECTION OF THE FACT THAT THE TUNA WEREN'T THERE LAST YEAR. THIS YEAR, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE TUNA HAVE APPEARED OFF THE ECUADORIAN COAST. YOU KNOW, IT STARTS IN JANUARY. THAT IS WHEN THE SEASON RUNS. AND THERE WERE SOME OF THE VESSELS FROM THE UNITED STATES WHO WERE FISH-LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 09 STATE 034237

ING INSIDE THE LIMIT THAT THE ECUADORIANS HAVE DECLARED WITHOUT BUYING A LICENSE, AS THE ECUADORIAN LAW REQUIRES, AND THEY WERE SEIZED. BUT I THINK IT IS AN ISSUE THAT STANDS ON ITS OWN, AND WE DON'T INTERPRET IT AS PART OF THE TRADE BILL DISCUSSION. AND CERTAINLY THE ECUADORIANS HAVE NOT SAID THAT IT IS.

Q: THE ATMOSPHERE WAS ENFLAMED IN LATIN AMERICA AS A RESULT OF THE OPEC RESTRICTIONS JUST PRIOR TO THE SECRETARY'S CANCELLATION OF HIS TRIP -- POSTPONEMENT OF HIS TRIP. DO YOU SEE THESE RESTRICTIONS CONTINUING TO INHIBIT THE SECRETARY'S PLANS TO GO TO LATIN AMERICA? DO YOU THINK HE WILL BE ABLE TO HAVE A SUCCESSFUL TRIP WITH THESE RESTRICTIONS ON THE BOOKS?

A: I DO, YES. I DO NOT SEE THE OPEC CONTROVERSY OR DISCUSSION AS INHIBITING IT. HE DOES PLAN TO GO, AS YOU KNOW, AS HE HAS SAID, AND IN FACT WE ARE EXPLORING DATES RIGHT NOW.

MY OWN FEELING ABOUT IT IS THAT A DISTINCTION OUGHT TO BE MADE, IN GENERAL, WHEN WE THINK ABOUT LATIN AMERICA, AND I CERTAINLY MAKE THE DISTINCTION IN MY OWN MIND BETWEEN, IF YOU WILL, INTER-AMERICAN ISSUES AND BILATERAL RELATIONS.

AND WE SHOULD NOT CONFUSE THE TWO. IN OTHER WORDS, THERE ARE TIMES WHEN WE HAVE GOOD HEALTHY FAMILY DISCUSSIONS, IF YOU WILL, IN THE OAS ON AN INTER-AMERICAN LEVEL, AND AT THE SAME TIME, CONTINUE WITH VERY FRIENDLY BILATERAL RELATIONS WITH A LOT OF COUNTRIES IN THE HEMISPHERE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THERE ARE TIMES WHEN THE WARMTH AND CORDIALITY OF OAS AND REGIONAL MEETINGS IS JUST INCREDIBLE AT THE SAME TIME WE ARE HAVING GRAVE DIFFICULTIES WITH INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES.

MY OWN PERCEPTION IS THAT THE COUNTRIES THAT THE SECRETARY INTENDS TO TRAVEL TO IN LATIN AMERICA, ARE COUNTRIES WITH WHOM WE HAVE NOW AT THE PRESENT TIME VERY WARM BILATERAL RELATIONSHIPS; INDEED, WE HAVE WARM BILATERAL RELATIONSHIPS BY AND LARGE WITH ALL THE COUNTRIES IN THE HEMISPHERE.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 10 STATE 034237

PHERE.

AS YOU KNOW, I HAVE BEEN AROUND THIS GAME FOR SOME TIME,

AND MY OWN FEELING IS THAT, AS I THINK BACK, IT IS HARD FOR ME -- TRADE BILL DISPUTE AND ALL THAT ON THE TABLE -- IT IS VERY HARD FOR ME TO THINK OF A TIME IN WHICH OUR BILATERAL RELATIONSHIPS HAVE, OVER ALL, ON NET, BEEN BETTER THAN THEY ARE AT THE PRESENT TIME.

Q: YOU ARE STILL EXPLORING DATES IN APRIL?

A: CORRECT. MARCH AND APRIL.

Q: HOW CAN YOU HAVE WARM BILATERAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH A COUNTRY THAT SAYS CIA AGENTS STIMULATED THE RIOTS IN LIMA?

A: THE COUNTRY DIDN'T SAY THAT.

Q: THE PRESIDENT'S PERSONAL SECRETARY SAID IT.

A: THEN YOU HAVE A REPORT THAT I DIDN'T HAVE. WHAT I SAW FROM HIM, JERRY, WAS NOT THAT AT ALL -- AND THIS, OBVIOUSLY, IS ON DEEP BACKGROUND -- BUT THE REPORT THAT WE HAD FROM ZIMMERMAN -- HIS STATEMENT WAS THAT HE PINNED THE TROUBLE FOR THE DISTURBANCES ON THE APRA, AND HE DIDN'T MENTION THE CIA AT ALL.

ONE OR TWO OF THE NEWSPAPERS HAVE MENTIONED THE CIA IN VERY INFLAMMATORY WAYS, BUT YOU KNOW, WE HAVE MADE THE POINT VERY CLEARLY, BOTH PUBLICLY AND DIPLOMATICALLY. I MET WITH THE CHARGE HERE, THE DAY THAT STATEMENT WAS MADE AND I SAID TO HIM AS CLEARLY AS I COULD, "YOU HAVE OUR

ASSURANCE THAT THE CIA WAS IN NO WAY INVOLVED IN THOSE DISTURBANCES, AND THE GOVERNMENT OF PERU SHOULD UNDERSTAND THAT."

AND I THINK THEY DO UNDERSTAND THAT. AND I HAVE NOT SEEN ANY AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT WITH RESPECT TO THIS ISSUE.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 11 STATE 034237

IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT, -- ZIMMERMAN'S STATEMENT?

Q: NO, HE IS TALKING ABOUT OSCAR FAURA'S STATEMENT.

A: OH, OH, YES.

Q: AND HE SAID HE WOULDN'T EXCLUDE THE POSSIBILITY.

A: PERSONALLY, YES. WELL, WE DO;

Q: BUT WHEN A NEWSPAPER IN PERU PRINTS SOMETHING IT WOULD BE AN ENORMOUS ACT OF COURAGE IF IT WERE NOT FIRST CLEARED WITH THE GOVERNMENT, SO I TAKE IT THAT IT HAD SOME KIND OF BLESSING FROM SOMEBODY IN THE PERUVIAN GOVERNMENT OR IT WOULD NEVER HAVE SEEN THE LIGHT OF DAY. THAT'S WHY I RAISE THE POINT.

A: YES.

Q: ON ANOTHER MATTER, ANOTHER POSSIBILITY, YOU HAVE SAID THAT YOU THINK A CONSENSUS HAS DEVELOPED, OR IS DEVELOPING WITHIN THE OAS TO CHANGE THE CUBA TRADE EMBARGO TO MAKE IT A SIMPLE MAJORITY VOTE INSTEAD OF A TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY VOTE. COULD YOU BRING US UP TO DATE ON HOW FAR ALONG THAT IS, AND WHEN YOU EXPECT THE VOTE TO TAKE PLACE?

A: RIGHT. THE FACTS ARE, AS YOU KNOW, THAT THE RIO TREATY UNDER WHICH THE MEASURES AGAINST CUBA WERE VOTED IN 1964 PROVIDES IN VERY GENERAL TERMS, THAT ALL ACTIONS OF THE ORGAN OF CONSULTATION, WHICH IS THE OPERATIONAL ENTITY THAT TAKES ACTION, MUST BE TAKEN BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE. IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY DISTINCTION BETWEEN WHAT KINDS OF ACTIONS.

AND IT HAS BEEN GENERALLY INTERPRETED, THEREFORE, THAT THE TWO-THIRDS REQUIREMENT OBTAINED WITH RESPECT TO ESSENTIALLY ALL ACTIONS, INCLUDING THE LIFTING OF SANCTIONS. A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES HAVE, AS A RESULT OF THE QUITO MEETING, BEEN UNHAPPY WITH THE FACT THAT THE RIO TREATY HAS ALWAYS PROVIDED FOR A TWO-THIRDS VOTE ON EVERYTHING, INCLUDING THE LIFTING OF SANCTIONS.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 12 STATE 034237

THEY HAVE PROPOSED, THEREFORE, SUBSEQUENT TO THE RIO TREATY, IN THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE (WHICH IS THE ORGAN WITHIN THE OAS DESIGNATED TO CONSIDER REFORMATION OF THE OAS) THAT THERE BE A SPECIAL PROVISION PROVIDING IN THE RIO TREATY THAT SANCTIONS CAN BE LIFTED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

THAT AMENDMENT TO THE RIO TREATY, HAS NOW BEEN AGREED TO IN PRINCIPLE BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF ALL THE GOVERNMENTS. IT NEEDS TO GO THROUGH ONE OR TWO MORE FORMAL STEPS NOW. AND IT NEEDS TO BE AGREED TO IN PRINCIPLE AT A HIGHER LEVEL BY THE REPRESENTATIVES -- PRESUMABLY BY THE FOREIGN MINISTERS, WHO WILL BE MEETING HERE IN APRIL.

AND THEN, OBVIOUSLY, IT NEEDS TO BE SIGNED AND RATIFIED.

BUT THE DECISION, IN PRINCIPLE, ESSENTIALLY HAS BEEN MADE

-- IF THESE REPRESENTATIVES ARE SPEAKING EFFECTIVELY ON BEHALF OF THEIR GOVERNMENTS.

Q: WOULD YOU EXPECT ACTION, THEN, IN APRIL? NOT ONLY ON THE AMENDMENT, BUT POSSIBLY ON THE ENDING OF THE EMBARGO?

A: YES, I SHOULD THINK -- WELL, I THINK THAT THE FOREIGN MINISTERS CAN -- I HAVEN'T SEEN THE AGENDA AND THAT'S WHY I AM PUZZLED ABOUT THIS. BUT MY GUESS IS THAT THE AGENDA WILL INCLUDE A PROVISION FOR THE FOREIGN MINISTERS TO ACT ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE RIO TREATY.

Q: THIS CHANGE IN THE VOTING FROM TWO-THIRDS TO A SIMPLE MAJORITY -- WILL THAT APPLY ONLY TO THE LIFTING OF THESE SANCTIONS -- OR WILL IT BE ANY CHANGE WITHIN THE RIO TREATY?

A: MY UNDERSTANDING OF THAT IS THAT IT IS AN AMENDMENT TO THE PRESENT GENERAL PROVISION TO THE RIO TREATY -- ARTICLE XVII, OR I'VE FORGOTTEN NOW -- BUT ONE OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE RIO TREATY SAYS THAT ALL MEASURES TAKEN BY THE ORGAN OF CONSULTATION MUST BE DONE BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 13 STATE 034237

"ALL MEASURES" MEANS ESSENTIALLY EVERYTHING, INCLUDING ONE, TWO, THREE, FOUR, FIVE -- AND THE LIFTING OF SANCTIONS -- IT DOESN'T SAY THAT, BUT IT HAS SO BEEN INTERPRETED.

NOW MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE AMENDMENT TO THE TREATY WILL PROVIDE SOMETHING ALONG THE LINES OF: "ALL MEASURES MUST BE TAKEN BY TWO THIRDS -- EXCEPT THAT WHEN THERE ARE MEASURES OF SANCTION, THEY CAN BE REMOVED BY A MAJORITY."

Q: MR. ROGERS, IF THE ASSEMBLY WERE TO AMEND THE RIO TREATY AND ALLOW FOR THE PASSING OF SANCTIONS THROUGH A SIMPLE MAJORITY -- TELL ME, HOW LONG DO YOU FIGURE IT WILL TAKE FOR THE RATIFICATION TO BE IN FORCE? THREE, OR FIVE YEARS, TO HAVE THESE RATIFICATIONS?

A: OH, I THINK IT COULD BE DONE IN LESS THAN THREE YEARS.

Q: LESS THAN THREE YEARS?

A: SURE. I MEAN, IF THE COUNTRIES WANT TO HAVE IT DONE. IT'S UP TO THE COUNTRIES, OBVIOUSLY.

Q: YES -- WELL THE CHARTER TOOK THREE YEARS.

A: YES.

THAT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT EVERY CHANGE THAT RE-
QUIRES RATIFICATION IS GOING TO TAKE THREE YEARS. I
DON'T REALLY HAVE A SPECULATION FOR YOU, BUT IT OBVIOUSLY
CAN BE DONE IN LESS THAN THAT -- DEPENDING ON WHETHER
THE COUNTRIES WANT TO DO IT OR NOT.

Q: BUT THAT, AT LEAST, WOULD TAKE TWO YEARS.

A: HARD TO TELL.

Q: WELL MY POINT IS THAT NO DECISION CAN BE TAKEN ON THE
CUBAN ISSUE -- EVEN IF THE PACT IS AMENDED IN THE APRIL
MEETING -- THIS CANNOT BE WITHIN ONE YEAR -- EVEN THE
U.S. CONGRESS WOULDN'T RATIFY A TREATY IN ONE YEAR.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 14 STATE 034237

SO I MEAN, MY FEELING IS THAT THE THOUGHT THAT THE PROBLEM
CAN BE SOLVED IN APRIL, IS ACADEMIC, BECAUSE EVEN IF THE
TREATY IS AMENDED ON PAPER, IT WOULD TAKE A COUPLE OF
YEARS (FOR RATIFICATION).

A: WELL, DID I SAY IT WAS GOING TO BE "SOLVED" IN APRIL?
I DON'T THINK I SAID THAT.

Q: NO, YOU SAID YOU THOUGHT SOME ACTION MIGHT BE TAKEN.

A: RIGHT.

Q: ON THE EMBARGO, IN APRIL.

A: YES.

Q: IN OTHER WORDS, COULD THEY EFFECTIVELY, UNDER THE PRO-

VISIONS OF THE TREATY -- WELL NO -- ASSUMING THERE IS A
MAJORITY SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENT, COULD THEY ACTUALLY
VOTE, BY A SIMPLE MAJORITY AND END THE SANCTIONS?

A: I SUPPOSE, YES, I SUPPOSE THEORETICALLY THAT IS CON-
CEIVABLE, SURE -- AS A MATTER OF JURISPRUDENCE.

Q: LEAVING THE LEGALITIES ASIDE, AND THE CHARTER, DO YOU
SEE ANY CHANGE IN THE MAJORITY-MINORITY DEVELOPING SINCE
QUITO?

THAT IS, ARE SOME OF THE NAY-SAYERS MOVING?

A: THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION, DAVID. I HAVEN'T SEEN ANY OF THE COUNTRIES THAT HAVE CHANGED POSITION ON THIS MATTER SO FAR.

ON THE MATTER ESSENTIALLY OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE PREPARED NOW TO VOTE AFFIRMATIVELY TO LIFT THE SANCTIONS, THE ONE THING THAT HAS CHANGED IS WITH RESPECT TO THE MATTER OF PRINCIPLE. "SHOULD SANCTION-LIFTING BE DONE BY A MAJORITY OR BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE," SHALL WE SAY.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 15 STATE 034237

AND I THINK I READ THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE'S DETERMINATION AS ESSENTIALLY A DETERMINATION IN PRINCIPLE THAT MAJORITIES OUGHT TO RULE THAT QUESTION.

Q: THE REASON I ASK IS THAT ONE COULD EXTRAPOLATE THE SOLIDARITY THAT HAS DEVELOPED OVER THE TRADE BILL TO INDICATE THAT THERE MIGHT BE ANOTHER KIND OF SOLIDARITY OR A "LARGER SOLIDARITY" ON THE CUBA ISSUE -- AND THIS IS WHAT I WAS ASKING.

A: WELL, THERE ARE "SOLIDARITIES" AND "SOLIDARITIES" AS YOU KNOW, IN LATIN AMERICA. (LAUGHTER.)

THERE ARE SOME THINGS THAT UNIFY LATIN AMERICA WITH EXQUISITE SOLIDARITY, AND THERE ARE OTHER THINGS IN WHICH IT IS, LET'S SAY, NOT QUITE AS EASY TO CREATE A UNANIMITY ABOUT.

Q: COULD YOU CLARIFY EXACTLY WHAT YOU MEAN BY "WHAT IS LIKELY TO HAPPEN AT THE FOREIGN MINISTERS" MEETING IN APRIL?"

I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS A POSSIBILITY OF AMENDING THE RIO PACT SO THAT THE TWO-THIRDS VOTE CAN BE A MAJORITY VOTE ON CERTAIN THINGS. BUT DID YOU ALSO ANSWER THAT YOU ANTICIPATED A WAY BY WHICH THE OAS COULD LIFT THE SANCTIONS

IN APRIL?

OR IS ARY CORRECT THAT THAT WOULD NEED A PRIOR RATIFICATION OF THE VARIOUS CONGRESSES AND INSTITUTIONS IN THE HEMISPHERE? NOW WHICH ARE WE TALKING ABOUT THERE, PLEASE?

A: WELL, THIS IS HIGHLY SPECULATIVE, OBVIOUSLY, BUT WE HAVEN'T SEEN ANY MEASURE PROPOSED BY ANY LATIN AMERICANS YET, WITH RESPECT TO THAT QUESTION. ARY IS PERFECTLY CORRECT. YOU CAN SIGN THE AMENDMENT TO THE RIO TREATY,

AND IT'S GOING TO TAKE "X" NUMBER OF MONTHS OR YEARS.
AND UNLESS THE LATIN AMERICANS MAKE A VERY SPECIAL EFFORT
TO RATIFY, IT'S GOING TO TAKE "X" NUMBER OF MONTHS OR
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 16 STATE 034237

YEARS BEFORE THAT AMENDMENT IS EFFECTIVE.

NOW THE QUESTION THEN BECOMES, WHETHER THERE IS A SENTI-
MENT ESSENTIALLY TO APPLY THE AGREEMENT " EN PRINCIPLE" TO
THE SPECIFIC CUBAN CASE -- BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF
THE RIO AMENDMENT.

RIGHT? THAT S THE QUESTION?

Q: COULD THAT BE DONE?

A: COULD IT, JURIDICALLY?

Q: YES.

A: I ASSUME IT CAN BE, JURIDICALLY; SURE.

Q: HOW? BY WHAT PROCESS CAN THEY JUST GET TOGETHER AND
THEN DECIDE TO DISPENSE WITH THE RATIFICATION?

I MEAN, HOW CAN THEY DO IT JURIDICALLY?

Q: ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS?

Q: IT WAS ESTABLISHED IN THE BUENOS AIRES CONFERENCE WHEN
THE CHARTER OF THE OAS WAS AMENDED, A RESOLUTION WAS
PASSED -- AND UNTIL THE RATIFICATION WENT INTO FORCE, THE
OAS WILL ACT ON THE SPIRIT OF THE AMENDMENT....

A: SURE, I THINK SPECULATIVELY, THERE ARE A LOT OF WAYS...

Q: YOU MEAN THAT WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE AMENDMENT, THEY
CAN DO SOMETHING "WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE AMENDMENT" IS
THAT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

A: NOW YOU ARE INSPIRING MY LEGALISTIC TALENTS, AND THE

FACT OF THE MATTER IS, WE HAVEN'T WRITTEN ANYTHING OUT,
YOU KNOW, AND SAID: "WOULD THIS RESOLUTION BE JURIDICAL-
LY ACCEPTABLE?" OR WHAT HAVE YOU --

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 17 STATE 034237

SO IN TERMS OF ARY'S WORD FORMULA "IN THE SPIRIT OF THE AMENDMENT" OR SOMETHING -- I REALLY HAVEN'T THOUGHT THAT THROUGH CAREFULLY ENOUGH TO SAY THAT HE IS ON THE RIGHT TRACK, OR THAT HE OUGHT TO GET ANOTHER FORMULA OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

BUT I THINK IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT IN PRINCIPLE THERE, IT IS IN THE HANDS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE OAS, AND MOST PARTICULARLY, OBVIOUSLY, THE LATINS, TO DO THIS ANY WAY THEY WANT TO DO IT.

Q: IN GENERAL, BILL, HAS THERE BEEN ANY MOVEMENT AT ALL IN U.S.-CUBAN RELATIONS?

I NOTICED TODAY THAT THERE WERE THREE AMERICANS RELEASED FROM CUBAN PRISONS.

A: YES.

Q: HAS THERE BEEN ANY DIALOGUE -- ANYTHING GOING ON AT ALL IN THE LAST SEVERAL MONTHS?

A: I HAVE DISCOVERED, IN MY SHORT STAY IN PUBLIC LIFE, THAT THE PRESS IS NOT THE MOST IDEAL METHOD FOR DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION -- WITH ALL DUE RESPECT. (LAUGHTER.)

BUT IN ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION, AND AT THE RISK OF BEING--

Q: DID YOU GET THAT IDEA FROM KISSINGER?

A: I LEARNED IT ALL BY MYSELF. (LAUGHTER.)

Q: ...CONGRESS DOESN'T REVERSE OUR TRADE BILLS?

A: NO, NO, I DON'T MEAN TO MAKE THE OBSERVATION THAT CONGRESS IS THE BEST METHOD OF DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION EITHER.

BUT NOW IN ANSWER TO YOUR SPECIFIC QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO THE THREE PEOPLE WHO WERE RELEASED -- AND WITHOUT SEEMING TO SAY "THE UNITED STATES IS HOSTILE AND REJECTS ANY LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 18 STATE 034237

OVERTURES BY CUBA," OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT.

THE FACT OF THE MATTER WAS THAT THOSE THREE PEOPLE WERE PEOPLE WHOSE PRESCRIBED TERMS OF IMPRISONMENT FOR DRUG

OFFENSES HAD EXPIRED, AND I DON'T THINK, THEREFORE, THAT THAT WAS INTENDED AS A CONCILIATORY GESTURE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, I THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY ON BACKGROUND THAT, YOU KNOW, THE MOOD IN RECENT MONTHS HAS NOT BEEN HOSTILE. WE HAVE TAKEN NOTE OF WHAT CASTRO HAS BEEN SAYING, AND THE OTHERS.

I THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY, THEREFORE, THAT THAT MOOD, AND THE KINDS OF THINGS THAT HE HAS BEEN SAYING, WE HAVE BEEN PAYING ATTENTION TO.

Q: WE KNOW THAT THE ADMINISTRATION IS MAKING AN EFFORT TO MAKE SOME CHANGES AT THE CONGRESSIONAL LEVEL IN THE TRADE BILL, WITH PARTICULAR REGARD TO VENEZUELA AND ECUADOR.

NOW THAT WASN'T THE ONLY BILL THAT WENT THROUGH IN THE LAST WEEK OF THE SESSION, HOWEVER.

ANOTHER ONE CUT OFF AID TO CHILE. WHAT IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY, OR WHAT ARE ITS DESIRES IN REGARD TO MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO CHILE, IN THE PERIOD THAT WE ARE NOW IN?

ARE YOU MAKING A SIMILAR EFFORT TO RESTORE THAT TOO?

A: YES, WE WERE OPPOSED TO THE ABSOLUTE BAN ON ANY FURTHER ASSISTANCE TO CHILE, AND WE ARE STILL OPPOSED TO IT, AND WE WILL MAKE AN EFFORT TO HAVE THAT REMOVED IN THE NEXT CONGRESS.

Q: DID YOU LOBBY IN THE WANING DAYS THERE WHEN THE FOREIGN AID BILL WAS UP BEFORE THE CONGRESS?

A: YES.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 19 STATE 034237

Q: AGAINST THIS AMENDMENT?

A: YES.

Q: COULD YOU TAKE IT BACK TO ECUADOR AGAIN?

HAVE YOU BEEN GIVEN TO UNDERSTAND BY THE ECUADORIANS THAT IF THE TUNA HADN'T BEEN SWIMMING DOWN THAT WAY, THERE WOULD BE NO OCCASION FOR ANY INTERFERENCE WITH AMERICAN SHIPS GOING WITHIN 200 MILES OF THAT COAST?

A: I THINK, DAVID, THERE WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN ANY TUNA

VESSELS THERE, AND THEREFORE, NOTHING TO HAVE BEEN APPRE-
HENDED FOR FAILURE TO GET LICENSES.

IS THIS RESPONSIVE TO YOUR QUESTION?

Q: WELL, LET'S TRY IT ANOTHER WAY:

HAVE THE ECUADORIANS INDICATED THAT THE ONLY REASON THEY
ARE GRABBING TUNA VESSELS IS BECAUSE THE TUNA BOATS HAVE
COME BACK INTO WHAT THEY REGARD AS ECUADORIAN WATERS?

A: RIGHT.

Q: ONLY FOR THAT?

A: YES. THAT'S EXACTLY RIGHT.

DO YOU MEAN: HAVE THEY RELATED THIS TO THE TRADE BILL --
IS THAT THE OTHER PART OF THE QUESTION?

Q: YES.

A: THEN THE ANSWER IS; "NO."

Q: DID THE TRADE BILL COME UP IN ANY DISCUSSIONS OF THE
TUNA, AT ALL?

A: NOT SO FAR AS I KNOW.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 20 STATE 034237

Q: MR. SECRETARY, A NEW SUBJECT:

CAN YOY SPEAK ON OUR NEGOTIATIONS WITH PANAMA? WHERE DO
WE STAND? WHAT'S THE OUTLOOK? WHAT'S YOUR ESTIMATE OF
THE SITUATION?

A: ALL RIGHT: I THINK THE BEST CHARACTERIZATION OF THE
NEGOTIATIONS HAS BEEN THE CHARACTERIZATION OF FOREIGN
MINISTER TACK, IN HIS RECENT STATEMENT TO THE PRESS IN
WHICH HE SAID THAT HE HAD TAKEN NOTE OF THE FACT THAT
SOME PEOPLE HAD SPECULATED ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF A
TREATY THIS SPRING OR SUMMER -- AND HE SAID, VERY CARE-
FULLY, THAT THE QUESTION WAS REALLY NOT "WHEN" BUT "WHAT
KIND OF A TREATY."

AND THAT WE WERE NOT GOING TO SET ANY DEADLINES ON IT.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THE NEGOTIATIONS ARE GOING FORWARD AND

I THINK THE FACT THAT THEY ARE GOING FORWARD IS AN INDICATION THAT BOTH SIDES FEEL THAT PROGRESS IS BEING MADE TOWARD A PACKAGE WHICH WILL BE -- AND WILL COMMEND ITSELF

TO THE RIGHT-MINDED PEOPLE -- BOTH IN PANAMA AND THE UNITED STATES, AS FAIR AND EQUITABLE IN DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF BOTH COUNTRIES.

Q: FOR AWHILE, WE WERE PUSHING FOR SPRING OR EARLY SUMMER AND WE WERE PUSHING VERY HARD. ARE WE NOW SEEING SOME SLIPPAGE IN THAT?

A: NO, I DON'T THINK THAT IS A CORRECT STATEMENT OF OUR POSITION.

I REALLY THINK THAT WHAT TACK HAD TO SAY IS RIGHT -- THAT WE ARE NOT OPERATING UNDER A DEADLINE HERE AND THAT IT'S IMPORTANT TO DO IT RIGHT, RATHER THAN WITHIN A CERTAIN PERIOD OF TIME. AND THAT HAS BEEN OUR POLICY ALL THE WAY ALONG THE LINE....

Q: YOU ARE A REALISTIC MAN. EVEN IF YOU GET AN AGREEMENT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 21 STATE 034237

BETWEEN SECRETARY KISSINGER AND FOREIGN MINISTER TACK, WHAT EARTHLY HOPE DO YOU HAVE OF GETTING CONGRESS TO RATIFY A TREATY IN THE SENATE AND THE TRANSFER OF PROPERTY IN THE HOUSE?

A: NOW WITH RESPECT TO THAT OBJECTIVE QUESTION, I WILL GIVE YOU AN OBJECTIVE ANSWER. (LAUGHTER.)

NO, I THINK IT'S A FAIR QUESTION. AND IT WOULD BE IDLE TO PRETEND THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE A "WALK THROUGH," IN TERMS OF THIS PARTICULAR NEGOTIATION. THERE ARE SOME PEOPLE WHO FEEL VERY STRONGLY ABOUT THIS, AND WE UNDERSTAND THOSE FEELINGS.

WE WILL, I PROMISE YOU, BE BRIEFING AND TALKING WITH CONGRESS AT GREAT LENGTH WHEN WE HAVE THE OUTLINES OF THIS TREATY PACKAGE. WE WILL BE ESSENTIALLY DISCUSSING IT AS A TREATY PACKAGE WHICH IS CONSISTENT WITH THE REALITIES OF THE LATE 20TH CENTURY -- AND WHICH ESSENTIALLY DEFENDS, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE FUNDAMENTAL INTERESTS OF BOTH PARTIES:

WITH RESPECT TO THE OPERATION OF THE CANAL

WITH RESPECT TO THE DEFENSE OF THE CANAL

WITH RESPECT TO THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN BOTH OF THOSE ACTIVITIES FOR SUCH A LONG TIME.

I AM PERSUADED -- I REALLY AM PERSUADED -- THAT WE CAN COMMEND THIS PACKAGE TO A CONSIDERABLE -- A MAJORITY --

TO MORE THAN TWO-THIRDS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES. I AM NOT PESSIMISTIC ABOUT THIS. I THINK THE TREATY PACKAGE WILL SELL ITSELF ON THE MERITS IN THAT RESPECT, AND I THINK IT WILL COMMEND ITSELF TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Q: YOUR EFFORTS TO MODIFY THE TRADE BILL, TO LIFT THE RESTRICTIONS ON ECUADOR AND VENEZUELA, IS THE DEPARTMENT'S EFFORT CONCENTRATED ON THOSE TWO COUNTRIES TO GET SOME LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 22 STATE 034237

KIND OF AN AMENDMENT THROUGH -- OR DOES IT APPLY ACROSS THE BOARD?

A: THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION, AND WE HAVEN'T DRAWN THE LINE PRECISELY.

WE HAVE NOT YET SETTLED ON WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE GOING TO ASK THE CONGRESS: "CUT IT OFF WITH ECUADOR AND VENEZUELA" OR "CONSIDER SOME OF THE OTHER COUNTRIES." THIS IS ONE OF THE KNOTTY ASPECTS OF THE AMENDMENT, AND I THINK YOU ARE RIGHT TO RAISE THAT POINT.

THE CONGRESS IS ALSO CONSIDERING IT VERY CAREFULLY AND, AS I SAY, THE TWO AMENDMENTS THAT HAVE NOW BEEN PUT INTO THE HOPPER, BOTH KENNEDY AND BENTSEN ARE DIFFERENT IN THIS RESPECT.

AND THIS ISN'T THE LAST OF THE STORY. I THINK THERE IS GOING TO BE CONSIDERABLE CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF THIS SENSITIVE PROBLEM.

Q: HAVE YOU MADE ANY PERSONAL EFFORTS, SINCE YOU WERE APPOINTED, TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF CIA ACTIVITIES IN CHILE BEFORE YOU ARRIVED HERE?

A: NO.

Q: YOU DON'T FEEL THAT THAT IS NECESSARY IN THE COURSE OF ADMINISTERING YOUR PRESENT RESPONSIBILITIES?

A: TO FIND OUT WHAT HAPPENED IN THE PAST?

Q: FIND OUT THE EXTENT OF THE ACCURACY AND THE TRUTH OF

SOME OF THE CHARGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE?

A: NO.

I KNOW WHAT I FEEL ABOUT WHAT WE OUGHT TO BE DOING NOW.

I HAVEN'T APPOINTED MYSELF A JUDGE AS TO WHAT HAPPENED IN

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 23 STATE 034237

THE PAST. IN FACT, PRECISELY WHAT HAPPENED IN THE PAST IS STILL LARGELY KNOWN TO THE AGENCY ITSELF, BUT NOT VERY WIDELY BEYOND THAT. THE FULL FACTS ON THAT ARE NOT KNOWN TO A LOT OF PEOPLE -- EVEN IN THIS BUILDING.

AND I HAVE NOT APPOINTED MYSELF TO THE JOB OF CHASING THEM DOWN.

Q: DO YOU HAVE ANY FEELING ABOUT WHETHER THE CIA SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN LATIN AMERICA?

A: YES. I STATED THAT FEELING TO THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE WHEN I WAS UP FOR CONFORMATION. SENATOR SPARKMAN ASKED ME THE QUESTION, AND I GAVE HIM A VERY HONEST ANSWER ABOUT IT.

I SAID I WAS BASICALLY OPPOSED TO IT AS A MATTER OF FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE. "I" PERSONALLY, THAT'S "ROGERS" TALKING AND NOT THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

THE FOLLOWING PORTION OF THE BRIEFING WAS LATER PUT ON THE RECORD.

Q: HAS THERE BEEN ANY REASSESSMENT OF THE NOMINATION OF HARRY SHLAUDEMAN AS AMBASSADOR TO VENEZUELA IN LIGHT OF THE FLAG-BURNINGS AND DEMONSTRATIONS, AND SO FORTH?

A: NO. OBVIOUSLY WE HAVE NOTED THAT, BUT WE DO NOT REGARD IT AS IN ANY SENSE THAT CONSEQUENTIAL. THE "AGREEMENT" WAS AGREED TO BY THE VENEZUELAN GOVERNMENT, AND THEY HAVE GIVEN EVERY INDICATION OF LOOKING FORWARD TO HARRY SHLAUDEMAN'S ARRIVAL AS AMBASSADOR THERE.

HE IS, AS YOU WELL KNOW, ONE OF THE TRULY OUTSTANDING FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS IN THIS COUNTRY. HE HAS PERFORMED CONSIDERABLE SERVICES TO U.S. RELATIONS IN LATIN AMERICA FOR ALLONG PERIOD OF TIME. THE IDEA THAT HE WAS AN INSTRUMENT OF SOME DEVIOUS, DISRUPTIVE CONSPIRACY HAS NO SUPPORT IN THE RECORD. AND I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT HE WILL BE AN OUTSTANDING ABMASSADOR OF THE UNITED STATES IN

VENEZUELA, AND AT A VERY IMPORTANT TIME IN U.S.-VENEZUELAN
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 24 STATE 034237

RELATIONS.

I PERSONALLY PLAYED NO SMALL ROLE IN THE SELECTION OF
THE NEXT AMBASSADOR FROM THE UNITED STATES TO VENEZUELA,
AND SHLAUDEMANN HAS MY PERSONAL SUPPORT. I WAS VERY STRON-
GLY FOR HIM AS THE BEST PERSON THAT WE COULD POSSIBLY
SEND ON THIS VERY CRITICAL AND IMPORTANT JOB.

Q: IF YOU WERE CALLED UP AS A CHARACTER WITNESS --

A: I WOULD SAY THE SAME THING.

END ON THE RECORD PORTION AND RESUME ON BACKGROUND.

Q: WOULD YOU SAY THE SAME FOR NAT DAVIS?

A: HE'S GOING TO BE MY COLLEAGUE IN AF.

I DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION. FROM WHAT I
KNOW ABOUT NAT, SURE, HE'S A GREAT FELLOW. BUT HIS NOMINA-
TION WAS NOT MY RESPONSIBILITY.

Q: I UNDERSTAND. BUT I MEAN IT'S BECAUSE OF HIS CHILE
DAYS THAT HE'S UNDER FIRE.

A: WELL, I THINK IT WOULD BE, REALLY, DAVID, BEYOND MY
RESPONSIBILITY ESSENTIALLY TO SAY THIS IS A GREAT
APPOINTMENT. I THINK IT IS. HE'S A GREAT FELLOW IN MY
JUDGMENT, ABSOLUTELY NO DOUBT ABOUT IT. BUT I CAN SAY
THAT ON A PERSONAL LEVEL RATHER THAN AN OFFICIAL LEVEL.

Q: YOU ARE LOSING TWO DEPUTIES, MR. SHLAUDEMANN AND
BOWDLER. DO YOU HAVE ANY REPLACEMENTS?

A: YES, SIR, WE SURE DO.

Q: MAY I INQUIRE AS TO THEIR IDENTITIES?

A: YOU MAY INQUIRE, I'M NOT GOING TO TELL YOU.

Q: WHAT KIND OF FUTURE DO YOU SEE FOR THE NEW DIALOGUE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 25 STATE 034237

THIS YEAR?

A: WELL, AS YOU KNOW, THE SECRETARY IS GOING DOWN. THAT'S NUMBER 1. NUMBER 2, WE WILL BE MEETING WITH A NUMBER OF FINANCE AND ECONOMY MINISTERS HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF MARCH. AND THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT WE WILL BE DISCUSSING A NUMBER OF ISSUES, INCLUDING THE TRADE BILL, AT THAT TIME. AND THEN THE FOREIGN MINISTERS ARE ALL COMING HERE IN APRIL. WE ARE GOING TO TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY, OBVIOUSLY, WHEN THEY ARE HERE TO MEET WITH THEM AND TO TALK WITH THEM AND TO CONTINUE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME KIND OF INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS THAT WE HAVE HAD IN SOME OF THE EARLIER NEW DIALOGUE MEETINGS.

Q: WHAT'S THE AMERICAN POSITION ON THE SANCTION AMENDMENT?

A: WELL, WE SUPPORTED IT IN THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE. ALL THE NATIONS OF THE HEMISPHERE SUPPORTED IT IN THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Q: YOU SAID EARLIER ABOUT THE SECRETARY'S VISIT TO LATIN AMERICA THAT THE DATES ARE BEING EXPLORED. IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING AS THE SITUATION STANDS NOW THAT THE VISIT WILL BE AFTER THE MIDDLE OF MARCH, TOWARD THE END OF MARCH, OR -- WHAT I'M THINKING ABOUT IS HE WILL BE GOING BACK TO THE MIDDLE EAST ABOUT MARCH 10.

A: IS THAT THE DATE HE'S GOING BACK?

Q: SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

A: WELL, I HAVEN'T BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS MIDDLE EAST SCHEDULE.

YES, MY GUESS IS OBVIOUSLY THAT IT WOULD HAVE TO BE AFTER WHATEVER SECOND TRIP HE MAKES TO THE MIDDLE EAST.

Q: THE CHILEAN GOVERNMENT HAS ALREADY ANNOUNCED THAT HE IS COMING AT THE END OF MARCH. AND IF THE CONFERENCE HERE IS ON APRIL 17, HE HAS ONLY GOT A FEW WEEKS LEFT?

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 26 STATE 034237

A: YOU'RE RIGHT, IT'S GOING TO BE TIGHT. YOU KNOW, THAT'S THE KIND OF SCHEDULE THAT HE KEEPS. WE WORK ON THOSE KINDS OF NARROW MARGINS.

Q: WHAT COUNTRIES IS HE CONTEMPLATING VISITING?

A: ACTUALLY, WE BETTER NOT SAY THAT OUT LOUD IN ANY REAL

WAY. I THINK THAT YOU KNOW WHAT COUNTRIES HAVE BEEN TALKED ABOUT.

Q: NO, I DON'T.

A: WELL, I THINK IT WOULD BE WRONG FOR AN AUTHORITATIVE STATE DEPARTMENT SOURCE TO SAY HE'S GOING TO COUNTRIES, A, B, C, D, E, AND F BEFORE WHAT WE HOPE FOR IN THIS IMPERFECT WORLD WE CAN HAVE, AND THAT IS A JOINT ANNOUNCEMENT IN ALL THE CAPITALS OF THE STATES AND PLACES. AND THIS IS WHAT WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO WORK FOR, AND UNTIL THAT TIME I WOULD JUST AS SOON NOT TALK.

Q: WHO WILL HEAD THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE FINANCE OFFICERS MEETING?

A: I THINK CHARLIE ROBINSON.

Q: NOT SIMON?

A: I DON'T THINK SO, NO. NOT FOR ANY SPECIAL WILD REASON. I THINK IT'S JUST THAT CHUCK IS AWARE OF THE TRADE BILL ISSUE.

Q: THANK YOU.

A: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

I HOPE YOU ALL WON'T RUN A LOT OF STORIES ABOUT STATE DEPARTMENT REACTION ON THE CUBAN ISSUE BECAUSE THAT WAS PRETTY MUCH OFF MY OWN PERSONAL RESPONSE IN TERMS OF THE MOOD. DON'T READ TOO MUCH INTO THAT.

THANKS VERY MUCH, I APPRECIATE IT. END BRIEFING
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 27 STATE 034237

BEGIN TEXT OF STATEMENT BY MR. ROGERS CONCERNING RESUMPTION OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN BOLIVIA AND CHILE:
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE WILLIAM D. ROGERS STATED TODAY HIS BELIEF THAT THE FEBRUARY 8 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE BOLIVIAN AND CHILEAN GOVERNMENTS TO RENEW DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS, WHICH WERE BROKEN IN 1962, IS A POSITIVE AND IMPORTANT STEP FORWARD IN STRENGTHENING REGIONAL STABILITY AND PEACE. MR. ROGERS EXPRESSED SATISFACTION THAT THE RENEWAL OF NORMAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES WAS MADE IN A SPIRIT OF MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND CONSTRUCTIVE INTENT. HE CITED AS PARTICULARLY ENCOURAGING THE REFERENCE IN THE "ACT OF CHARANA," WHERE THE BOLIVIAN AND CHILEAN PRESIDENTS MET, TO THE DECLARATION OF AYACUCHO

IN WHICH A NUMBER OF PRINCIPLES OF VITAL INTEREST TO THE
NATIONS OF THE HEMISPHERE WERE SET FORTH. END TEXT OF
STATEMENT BY MR. ROGERS. INGERSOLL

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: TEXT, PRESS CONFERENCES, BRIEFING MATERIALS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 15 FEB 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: MorefiRH
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE034237
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: BBELLCJZ
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750055-0556
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750239/aaaabiov.tel
Line Count: 1252
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN ARA
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 23
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: IN THE "ACT OF CHARANA," WHERE THE B, OLIVIAN AND
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: MorefiRH
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 28 MAY 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <28 MAY 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <30 MAY 2003 by MorefiRH>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: PRESS BRIEFING BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY ROGERS FOLLOWING IS TRANSCRIPT OF SPECIAL PRESS BACKGROUNDER
TAGS: PFOR, (ROGERS, WILLIAM D)
To: BONN
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006